



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,047	12/06/2001	Theodora Ross	UM-06692	6232

7590 03/17/2005

Tanya A. Arenson  
MELDEN & CARROLL, LLP  
Suite 350  
101 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER
----------

FETTEROLF, BRANDON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*ipl*

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/007,047

Applicant(s)

ROSS ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9,12-18,24-29,36 and 84-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 84-86 and 91-93 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9,12-18 and 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29 and 87-90 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1642

Ross *et al.*

Date of Priority: 11/15/2001

### *Response to Amendment*

The Amendment filed on 12/09/2004 in response to the previous Non-Final Office Action (09/08/2004) is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 9, 12-18, 24-29, 36 and 84-93 are currently pending.

Claims 85 and 92 are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention, i.e., detecting a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 4.

Claims 84, 86, 91 and 93 are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to a nonobvious invention which would require distinct steps different from those claimed in claims 9 and 24. Thus, claims 84, 86, 91 and 93 broaden the scope of the invention.

Claims 9, 12-18, 24-29, 36 and 87-89 are currently under consideration.

**The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.**

**All rejections and or objections are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and arguments there to.**

**New Rejections:**

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 24-29 and 87-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for characterizing prostate cancer, wherein the

Art Unit: 1642

presence or absence of HIP1 is indicative of either the risk of prostate specific antigen failure, the risk of the cancer metastasizing, the risk of cancer reoccurring or the state of the cancer, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of characterizing colon cancer, wherein the presence or absence of HIP1 is indicative of either the risk of prostate specific antigen failure, the risk of the cancer metastasizing, the risk of the cancer reoccurring or the state of cancer . The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The court in Wands states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.' " (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The instant claims read on a method of characterizing cancer in a subject comprising: (a) providing a sample from a subject, wherein the subject has been diagnosed with colon or prostate cancer; and (b) characterizing said sample by detecting the presence or absence of HIP1 in said sample with a reagent configured to detect a HIP1 nucleic acid having the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1, wherein said presence or absence of HIP1 in said sample is indicative of one or more properties of cancer selected from the group consisting of risk of prostate specific antigen failure, risk of cancer metastasizing, risk of cancer reoccurring, and stage of cancer. Thus, it appears that HIP1 in both colon and prostate tissues can be used as a marker for assessing the risk of prostate specific antigen failure, the risk of colon or prostate cancer metastasizing, the risk of colon or prostate cancer reoccurring or assessing the state of colon or prostate cancer.

However, the scope of the instant claims is not commensurate with the enablement of the instant disclosure, because practice of the claimed invention would require undue experimentation by an artisan of ordinary skill in the art. The instant specification is not enabling for claims drawn a method of characterizing colon cancer by measuring the absence or presence of HIP1 in a sample, wherein the absence or presence of HIP1 is indicative of risk of colon cancer metastasizing or the risk of colon cancer reoccurring or the stage of cancer. The specification teaches (page 4, lines 9-12) that HIP1 may be utilized in a method for characterizing prostate or colon tissue in a subject, wherein the presence or absence of HIP1 characterizes the tissue sample. Specifically, the specification teaches that (page 64, lines 6-12) in colon tissues, benign tissues were found not to express HIP1, whereas adjacent colon tumors showed high levels of HIP1 expression.

The specification does not appear to provide a nexus between the presence or absence of HIP1 in colon tissues and the patients risk of prostate specific antigen failure, the risk of colon cancer metastasizing, the risk of colon cancer reoccurring or assessing the state of colon cancer. Tockman *et al* (Cancer Res., 1992, 52:2711s-2718s) teach considerations necessary in bringing a cancer biomarker (intermediate end point marker) to successful clinical application. Although, the reference is drawn to biomarkers for early lung cancer detection, the basic principles taught are clearly applicable to other oncogenic disorders such as colon cancer. Tockman *et al* teaches that prior to the successful application of newly described markers, research must validate the markers against acknowledged disease end points, establish quantitative criteria for marker presence/absence and confirm marker predictive value in prospective population trials (see abstract). Early stage markers of carcinogenesis have clear biological plausibility as markers of preclinical cancer and **if validated** (emphasis added) can be used for population screening (p. 2713s, col. 1). The reference further teaches that once selected, the sensitivity and specificity of the biomarker must be validated to a known (histology/cytology-confirmed) cancer outcome. The essential element of the validation of an early detection marker is the ability to test the marker on clinical material obtained from subjects monitored in advance of clinical cancer and *link* those marker results with subsequent histological confirmation of disease. This irrefutable link between antecedent marker and subsequent acknowledged disease is the essence of a valid intermediate end point marker (p. 2714, see Biomarker Validation against Acknowledged Disease End Points). Clearly, prior to the successful application of newly described markers, markers must be validated against acknowledged disease end

Art Unit: 1642

points and the marker predictive value must be confirmed in prospective population trials (p. 2716s, col 2). In addition, Slamon et al. (Science Vol. 235, January 1987, pages 177-182) teach other essential factors that are known to be important in the prognosis of breast cancer in individual patients such as size of the primary tumor, stage of the disease at diagnosis, hormonal receptor status, and number of axillary lymph nodes involved with disease (page 178, 1<sup>st</sup> column, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph). Such data are critical to assessing actuarial curves for relapse (Figure 3), and for comparing disease-free survival and overall survival to prognostic factors (Table 4). In view of the teachings above, and the lack of guidance and or exemplification in the specification, it would not be predictable that the method would function as contemplated. Thus, it would require undue experimentation by one of skill in the art to practice the invention as claimed.

Claims 9, 12-18 and 23 appear to be allowable.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1642

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1642

BF

*Jeffrey Siew*  
**JEFFREY SIEW**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
*3/5/05*